PRESIDENT: All right, Senator Carpenter.

SENATOR CARPENTER: Well, I think it's a little bit luditrous as he does. I would like to have him to have the responsibility of killing it. And, I think he wants to. I think he ought to have it. Now, to be congenial and accept it, I ask to withdraw my objection.

PRESIDENT: Senator Carpenter is now removing his objections. So, we're back to Senator Stahmer's motion now which was to unanimous... he asked for unanimous consent to withdraw his motion to indefinitely postpone LR19. Are there objections? Hearing none, so ordered, his motion is withdrawn. Do we have other motions now on LR19 on this? Stand by.

CLERK: Mr. President, I move to indefinitely postpone LR19. Signed, Senator Chambers.

PRESIDENT: We now have before us the motion to indefinitely postpone LR19. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, and members of the Legislature. What I would rather have done would be to persuade the introducer to abandon his efforts. I thought he was going to do it a few days ago but he chose not to. Now, obviously, this is a racist resolution but there is evidence to indicate that the introducer is not. When I look at the types of legislation he has supported, it's difficult for me to see how he could be the one to carry this type of resolution to the Legislature. He has supported changes in election procedures which would give the unrepresented and the voiceless a voice in the determination of their own destiny. He is the one who has sponsored increasing exemptions on the homestead for the elderly and the poverty stricken. He has tried to more equitably spread the taxes that are paid in this state. He wants to tax insurance premium, he wanted to raise the tax on paramutuel betting, he wanted to tax intangibles. All of these laudible goals. So it's difficult, I say, to understand how he could introduce a resolution like this. Now, in considering it, we ought to ask the question. If people are concerned with the bus rides or if they're concerned about what's at the end of the bus rides. If it's a bus ride, then the whole thing is a sham because most of the children in rural Nebraska ride buses to school. I've visited rural schools and talked to the students and asked them how they get there. A large number say by a bus. There are groups that have come to this Capitol and the teachers have asked me to address the students which I always do. And they got here by a bus. It didn't seem to me that the bus ride had made them immoral, it had not made them illiterate, it had not made them unsocial, criminal beings. So nothing is wrong it itself with riding a bus. As a matter of fact, when we had a conflict of interest bill before this Legislature a couple of years ago, dealing with what kind of contract school board members could have with the school board they represented, the amount, the dollar amount that was allowed had to be raised because certain members of rural school boards manufacture and sell buses to the school system that they help control as a member of the board. So, again we say nothing is wrong with busing in with itself. If buses are ridden by white children to benefit white children, it's all right. Forty percent of the school children in this country ride a bus to school. Four out of every ten children ride a bus. In California, 800,000 children are bussed a day. It cost them \$100 million a year but only 1/2 of 1% of that number are bussed for the purpose of integration. So, again it's not the bus ride but what's at the end of it. There's some people who feel something terrible will happen if black children and white children share the same school room. And, I think, instead of hiding behind the smoke screen of an emotional, hypocritical issue like busing when, I say, rural school children ride buses, city children ride city buses, and they ride buses provided by the schools, the school system to school. The bus is not what it is. It ought to the school system to school. The bus is not what it is. It ought to change to say that the Legislature is interested in undoing what the Supreme Court tried to do in it's decision in the Bronx, against the Board of Education in Topeka where they said segregation in the public schools based on race violates the U. S. Constitution. That decision was based on the notion that once a system decides to establish public schools, a child cannot be kept from having an educational opportunity because of his or her race. That decision came in 1954